



\$~31

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

Date of decision: 18.07.2025

+ W.P.(C) 9815/2025
GAYATHRI V KARTHIKEYANPetitioner
Through: Mr.Shripal Upadhyay, Adv.
versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.Respondents
Through: Mr.Nirvikar Verma, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RENU BHATNAGAR

NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)

CM APPL. 41032/2025 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 9815/2025

2. This petition has been filed by the petitioner, challenging the Order dated 06.06.2025 passed by the respondent no.3, whereby the request of the petitioner for the conduct of a Review Medical Board was refused.

3. The present petition arises out of the following facts:

3.1The respondents issued an Examination Notice No. AFCAT-02/2024 in May 2024, inviting applications for the Air Force Common Admission Test-2024, for recruitment into various branches of the Indian Air Force (IAF).

3.2The petitioner appeared in the written test, and successfully qualified for the same. Consequently, the petitioner was called



by the Service Selection Board (SSB) for an interview and was thereafter shortlisted for the medical examination for commissioning in the Technical Branch of the Indian Air Force.

3.3 The petitioner was called by the respondent for the Detailed Medical Examination (DME) conducted on 22.01.2025. However, she was declared medically 'unfit' for the same on account of the following grounds:

- “(i) *ANAEMIA*
- (ii) *CARDIAC MURMUR*
- (iii) *ASD CLOSURE DEVICE IN SITU*”

3.4 Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner filed an appeal.

3.5 The Appeal Medical Board, *vide* its report dated 07.03.2025, again declared the petitioner medically 'unfit', however, this time only on the ground of 'ASD CLOSURE DEVICE IN SITU'.

3.6 The petitioner, thereafter, obtained a certificate dated 29.03.2025 from the Amrita Institute of Medical Science and Research Centre, which stated that in the year 2002, she was diagnosed with an atrial septal defect, and the same was closed without surgery by means of a catheter. It was further certified that she has since remained completely well and fit. The certificate also stated that there are no significant residual concerns and that she is fit to pursue any form of physical activity. Along with that certificate, however, there was also a certificate stating that she underwent ASD device closure in 2005, and that the device is in good condition with normal functioning.



3.7As noted hereinabove, the respondent no.3, by the Impugned Order dated 06.06.2025, refused the application of the petitioner for a Review Medical Board, stating that she has been declared medically 'unfit' due to 'ASD CLOSURE DEVICE IN SITU'.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the Impugned Order does not provide any reason for rejecting the prayer of the petitioner for a Review Medical Board. He further places reliance on the certificate dated 29.03.2025 referred to hereinabove, to submit that the medical expert has certified that the defect was closed without surgery, by catheterization alone, and that the petitioner has been completely well since then, with no significant residual concerns, and is fit to pursue any form of activity. He, therefore, submits that the Impugned Order is liable to be set aside.

5. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the respondents, who appears on advance notice of this petition, submits that from the own documents of the petitioner, it is evident that she has an ASD Device implanted to address a heart condition she previously suffered from. He submits that as the Impugned Notification pertains to the Armed Forces, such a medical condition cannot be accepted, and the petitioner was therefore rightly declared medically 'unfit'.

6. He further submits that, in view of the petitioner's own admission regarding the presence of the device, there was no necessity to constitute a Review Medical Board, as there was no dispute about the existence of the same.

7. We have considered the submissions made by the learned



counsels for the parties.

8. At the outset, we would note that the examination in question pertains to the Flying Branch and Ground Duty (Technical and Non-Technical) Branches/NCC Special Entry for Courses commencing in July 2025 in the Indian Air Force. It need not be re-emphasized that the candidates for such roles must fall within Shape-I Medical Category, given the rigorous nature of the duties they are expected to perform upon selection.

9. In the present case, from the petitioner's own medical documents, it is evident that she has an ASD Closure Device in Situ.

10. While she may be able to carry out all other activities with this device, we are of the view that considering the stringent medical standards required for the Indian Air Force, there can be no compromise in the medical condition of the candidate. Candidates must be in optimal medical condition, and the presence of such a device disqualifies her from meeting those standards.

11. For the above reasons, we find no infirmity in the Impugned Order rejecting the request of the petitioner for a Review Medical Board.

12. The petition is, accordingly, dismissed. The pending application is also disposed of, having been rendered infructuous.

13. There shall be no order as to costs.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

RENU BHATNAGAR, J

JULY 18, 2025/Arya/DG